

**Remarks**

Claims 1 and 22 are pending in the above-identified application and have been rejected in the most recent Office Action. Claims 2-21 and 23-32 have been cancelled. Claims 33-41 were added by Preliminary Amendment electronically filed on January 31, 2006, but have not been examined. The January 31, 2006, Preliminary Amendment is accessible through Private PAIR, but appears to have been mislabeled as a "Response to Restriction Requirement." Applicant respectfully traverses each ground of rejection and requests reconsideration and further examination of the application under 37 CFR § 1.111. Applicant responds to each ground of rejection and objection as follows.

**A. Claims 1 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dollesin (U.S. Patent No. 6,620,752) in view of Van Vleet (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,845).**

Dollesin discloses an external equipment carrier with a cargo holder including an arm with a front end for being attached to a trailer hitch on a vehicle. Dollesin further discloses a manual scissors jack and a vertical guide rail connected to the back of the arm with the top of the jack slideable along the guide rail. A cargo holder is removably carried on a support bar at the top of the jack, and can be raised or lowered by operating the jack. The cargo holder includes retractable legs and wheels. Van Vleet discloses a rolled hitch. In contrast, Applicants' claim 1 requires a lift system interposed between the base and the upper frame for moving the wheeled base relative to the platform between a transport position and a freestanding position. The above-

cited reference does not disclose or suggest the lift system element required by Applicants' independent claim 1. Dollesin discloses a jack connected to a vehicle an arm for raising cargo attached thereto off of the ground. The Dollesin jack can only lift cargo connected to the vehicle. In contrast, the lift system of the present invention is attached to the platform and operates to raise and lower the platform independently of its connection to a vehicle.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. MPEP §§ 706.02(j) and 2142.03. Neither Dollesin nor Van Vleet, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a lift system that is attached to the platform and operates to raise and lower the platform independently of its connection to a vehicle. Therefore, since the references of record do not teach or suggest the combination of elements of Applicants' claim 1, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Applicant's claim 1 is allowable over the above-cited art. It is respectfully requested that the above rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 22, claim 22 as previously amended similarly requires "a lift system interposed between the base and the upper platform for moving the wheeled base relative to the upper platform between a transport position and a use position". As noted above, Dollesin does not disclose the elements of a lift system coupled to an upper platform for moving the platform between a transport position and a use position. Therefore, since the cited reference does not teach or suggest the combination

of elements of Applicants' claim 22, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Applicant's claim 22 is allowable over the above-cited art. It is respectfully requested that the above rejection be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 33-41 do not appear to have been examined.**

Claims 33-41 were added by Preliminary Amendment electronically filed on January 31, 2006, but have not been examined. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 33-41 are allowable over the prior art of record and requests allowance thereof.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for pending claims 1, 22, and 33-41. The undersigned welcomes a telephonic interview with the Examiner, if the Examiner believes that such an interview would facilitate review of this Amendment Response. Applicant requests a three-month extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge this extension fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0410. No additional fees are believed to be necessary; however, should any fees be deemed required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0410, but not to include any payment of issue fees.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/David E. Novak

David E. Novak  
Registration No. 50,752  
BINGHAM MCHALE LLP  
2700 Market Tower  
10 West Market Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-4900  
(317) 968-5317

12683-42334:1109995